

Atty. Dkt. No. A00067US

### REMARKS

The application was filed with 49 claims. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-49. Applicant has amended claims 8, 16 and 42. Applicant has canceled claims 1-7, 10-15, 17-36, 39-40, and 43-49. Thus, claims 8, 9, 16, 37, 38, 41, and 42 are currently pending. Applicant requests that the pending claims be reconsidered.

### Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) as including reference characters not mentioned in the description. Regarding Figure 11C, Applicant has amended the specification to add the reference characters 704 and 712 in the description. Regarding Figure 13C, Applicant has amended the specification to add reference characters 956, 964, 968, 972, 976, 992, and 996, as shown in the figure. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### Objection to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification under 37 C.F.R. § 1.126 as the numbering of the claims is not in accordance therewith. Applicant notes that the Examiner has changed misnumbered claims 38-48 to be claims 38-49. Applicant has canceled claims 39-40 and 43-49. Applicant has amended dependant claim 42 so that it depends from the proper claim, based upon the renumbering of the Examiner. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

Atty. Dkt. No. A00067US

The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the following informalities. First, paragraph 79 contains a reference to database 5048. Applicant has amended the specification from 5048 to 508, as an obvious typographical error is present. Within the same paragraph, Applicant also amended OFK and IFK to OFX and IFX, as obvious typographical errors are present. Second, the Examiner requests that the cross-reference section include current application numbers. Applicant has amended the specification to include the application number which was not available at the time of filing. Third, the Examiner objects to the specification because of the reference to figure 10, when only figure 10A and 10B are present. The Examiner suggests that the reference be changed to figure 10A and 10B, which are the correct drawings. Applicant has amended the specification so that figures 10A and 10B are referenced, pursuant to the recommendation of the Examiner. Applicant has also amended the specification in a similar manner to reference figures 11A-11C, rather than figure 11. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Applicant believes that the objections are now moot, and requests that the objections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejects claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has canceled claim 39, thus making the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-7, 10-12, 14, 17, 18-36, 39-40 and 43-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kumar et al. Applicant has canceled claims 1-7, 10-

Atty. Dkt. No. A00067US

12, 14, 17, 18-36, 39-40 and 43-49. Applicant therefore believes that the rejections are now moot. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 8, 9, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kumar et al. in view of Khan et al. A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires (1) motivation to modify the reference, (2) a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicant has amended claim 8 to include the limitations of base claim 1. No new matter has been added by the amendment. The Examiner acknowledges that Kumar et al. does not teach all of the limitations of claim 8. The Examiner argues that Khan teaches a customizable network user interface that allows a user to create, edit, or delete as many views as the user desires. Khan does not teach storing a plurality of view pages in a view page database. Further, Khan does not teach assigning different names to each of the view pages in order to distinguish the view pages from one another. Since the cited references do not teach all of the limitations of amended claim 8, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding claim 9, the Examiner argues that Khan teaches the selection of a desired view and the disk storage for storing the marked information. Khan does not teach retrieving from the view page database a selected view page and displaying the selected view page on the display. Furthermore, since claim 9 is dependent upon claim 8, which is not properly rejected, the rejection of claim 9 is also moot. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Atty. Dkt. No. A00067US

The Examiner rejects claim 37 based upon the combination of Kumar and Khan. The Examiner acknowledges that Kumar does not teach (1) creating and storing a plurality of view pages in a view page database of the host processor, (2) assigning a different name to each said view page to thereby distinguish said view pages from one another, and (3) selecting a view page from said view page database via a graphical user interface. The Examiner relies upon the same support in Khan, which was described in the previous paragraph, in order to teach these limitations. As noted above, Khan simply does not relate to the creating of views, storing of views, and retrieving of views as described in Applicant's application. Khan does not teach assigning different names to a plurality of view pages, nor selecting a view page from a view page database. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn because the references do not teach all of the claim limitations.

Regarding claim 38, since independent claim 37 from which it depends is not properly rejected, then the rejection of claim 38 is not proper. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner rejects claims 13, 15, 16, 41 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Kumar et al. in view of LeGall et al. Applicant has canceled claims 13 and 15, thus making those rejections moot. Applicant requests that the rejections to claims 13 and 15 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicant has amended claim 16 by adding the limitations of canceled claims 1 and 15, so that claim 16 is an independent claim. No new matter has been added by the amendment. Regarding claim 16, the Examiner acknowledges that Kumar fails to teach the following limitations of claim 16: (1) storing said modified selected monitor in said monitors database, and (2) displaying an updated view page on the display of the client

Atty. Dkt. No. A00067US

processor, said updated view page including said modified background color scheme of said selected monitor. The Examiner relies upon LeGall to teach these limitations.

The Examiner alleges that LeGall teaches a user configurable interactive display that allows the user to choose from categories of information for a variety of different sources and positions the information where the user wants it in the display. Examiner further relies upon LeGall to teach a lay out control area to adjust colors. LeGall does not allow a user to change color inside each view because LeGall does not control the rendering of information that is delivered from the website. LeGall's reference to color control is to the basics of HTML based page generation, where a user specifies font, style, size, color, etc. for a page rendering. This is not the same as selecting a color scheme for each view and each monitor. Further, the steps in claim 16 outline how the Applicant aggregates the data and then creates a presentation for the user. LeGall does not teach storing a modified selected monitor in a monitors database. Further, LeGall does not teach displaying an updated view page including the modified background color scheme of the selected monitor on the display of the client processor. Since the cited references fail to teach all of the limitations of amended claim 16, Applicant believes that the rejection of amended claim 16 is moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection and withdraw it.

Regarding claim 41, the Examiner acknowledges that Kumar does not teach selecting a new display color or a modified background color scheme. Examiner relies upon support in LeGall as applied to claims 13, 15, and 16, discussed in the previous two paragraphs. For the reasons stated above, LeGall does not teach the limitations which Kumar failed to teach. Again, LeGall receives information from a website and displays it, without creating a "monitor." Stated another way, LeGall is not aggregating content, but is allowing the creation of a picture in picture

Atty. Dkt. No. A00067US

with color control for the display as a whole. Since the cited references do not teach all of the claim limitations, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding claim 42, since the independent claim from which it depends is not properly rejected, then the rejection of claim 42 is not proper. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant has merely commented upon certain aspects of the invention and reserve the right to provide further comments as necessary. Applicant notes that these remarks should not create limitations to the claims and that the claim language itself should be considered.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

June 27, 2005

By

Doug Schelling

**WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS, LLP**  
Suite 800  
1715 Aaron Brenner Drive  
Memphis, TN 38120-4367  
Phone: 901-537-1049  
Fax: 901-537-1010

Douglas W. Schelling, Ph.D.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 48,335

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or any future papers, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No 502346 for any such fees; and applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time.